



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/927,321	08/10/2001	Dirk Walther	ICYTP011	4696
22434	7590	10/02/2003	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP P.O. BOX 778 BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778			MAHATAN, CHANNING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1631	

DATE MAILED: 10/02/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/927,321

Applicant(s)

WALTHER ET AL.

Examiner

Channing S. Mahatan

Art Unit

1631

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-61 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

Restriction/Election Requirement

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 1-28; drawn to a method, computer program product, and computing device for a determining a sequence of a nucleic acid polymer, classified in class 702, subclass 19 and 20.
- II. Claims 29-32; drawn to a method, computer program product, and computing device for estimating the probability that a basecall was missed between two adjacent assigned basecalls, classified in class 702, subclass 19 and 20.
- III. Claims 33-56; drawn to a method, computer program product, and computing device for benchmarking basecaller performance, classified in class 702, subclass 19 and 20.
- IV. Claims 57 and 58; drawn to a call quality score, classified in class 702, subclass 19.
- V. Claims 59-61, drawn to a gap-quality score, classified in class 702, subclass 19.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because:

The inventions Groups I, II, and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (M.P.E.P. § 806.04, M.P.E.P. § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions directed to products and methods having different functions, different effects, and different modes of operations. Group I is directed to determining a sequence of a nucleic acid polymer. Group II is directed to estimating the probability that a basecall was missed between two adjacent assigned basecalls. Group III is directed to

benchmarking basecaller performance. The above methods are classified within the same class and subclass, however such classification does not exclude such processes from restriction since it is shown that each invention contains divergent subject matter, and are distinctly different processes. Thus, Groups I, II, and III have different functions, different effects (i.e. different results), and different modes of operation.

The inventions of Groups I-V are related as products and distinct processes of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P. § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the processes of Groups I-III can use the distinctly different products of Groups IV and V. Groups IV and V are distinctly different products since they are directed either to a call quality score (Group IV) or gap quality score (Group V), wherein the call quality score relies on continuously varying parameters of basecall quality while the gap quality score estimates the probability that a basecall was missed following a given assigned basecall. The call quality score of Group IV or the gap-quality score of Group V can be used in the distinct processes of the inventions of Group I (method, computer program product, and computing device for determining a sequence of a nucleic acid polymer), in the distinct method of Group II (method, computer program product, and computing device for estimating the probability that a basecall was missed between two adjacent assigned basecalls), or in the distinct method of Group III (method, computer program product, and computing device for benchmarking basecaller performance).

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicants are advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 C.F.R. § 1.143).

INVENTORSHIP AMENDMENT

Applicants are reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i).

EXAMINER INFORMATION

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technical Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technical Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notices published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1988), 1156 OG 61 (November 16, 1993), and 1157 OG 94 (December 28, 1993) (See 37 C.F.R. § 1.6(d)). The CM1 Fax Center number is either (703) 308-4242 or (703) 305-3014.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Channing S. Mahatan whose telephone number is (703) 308-2380. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30-5:00).

Application/Control Number: 09/927,321
Art Unit: 1631

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael P. Woodward, Ph.D., can be reached on (703) 308-4028.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to Legal Instruments Examiner, Tina M. Plunkett, whose telephone number is (703) 305-3524 or to the Technical Center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Date: *September 28, 2003*
Examiner Initials: *CSM*

Marianne P. Allen
MARIANNE P. ALLEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1800
A41631